REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The application has been amended in response to more clearly describe the present inventions. The pending and amended claims overcome the rejections of claims 1, 2 and 4-31 based on the applied references. No new matter has been added.

PENDING REJECTIONS AND OBJECTIONS

The Abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains the phrase "The invention" which the Examiner asserts can be implied.

Claim 15 is objected to under 36 C.F.R. 1.75(c), as being if improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Claims 1-2, 13-14, 25-26 and 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0174050 to Eynard *et al.* ("Eynard *et al.*").

Claims 4-10, 16-22, and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eynard *et al.*, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,726 issued to Hanzek ("Hanzek").

Claims 11-12, 23-24 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eynard *et al.* in view of Hanzek, and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0144174 to Nwabueze ("Nwabueze").

OBJECTION TO THE ABSTRACT

Applicant has amended the abstract to delete reference to "The invention." Application respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

OBJECTION TO CLAIM 15

Claim 15 has been amended to properly depend from claim 13. Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Although Applicants disagree with the propriety of the rejections proposed by the Office Action for claims 1, 2 and 4-31, Applicants have nevertheless amended the claims to clarify distinctions between the claims and the prior art of record. Specifically, independent claims 1, 13, 25 and 27 have each been amended. Claim 1, a system claim, now recites a "a network server for receiving user input to remotely manipulate or modify at least one report generated by at least one data source, the user input being initiated by activation of a markup language construct associated with the at least one report, the network server serving to translate the user input received via first network enabled code to second network enabled code." Claim 27, also a system claim, now recites "a user interface for: (1) remotely accessing and viewing at least one report generated from at least one remote data source, and (2) providing user input to remotely manipulate and/or modify the at least one report, the user input being provided by activating a markup language construct, the user input being translated from a first network enabled code to a second network enabled code." Claims 13 and 25, both method claims, now recite the step of "translating the user input received from a first network enabled code to a second network enabled code."

Applicants respectfully submits that Eynard et al. does not teach or suggest the step or function of "translating the user input received from a first network enabled code to a second network enabled code," as recited in amended claims 1, 13, 25 and 27. In fact, Eynard et al. is

not analogous art to the claimed systems and methods because it relates to a system that "facilitates the description of new goods and/or services being offered for exchange in terms developed by a trading community that are recognized in that trading community as commercially reasonable and facilitates user-defined qualifications for various limits to bring about further or different cooperation amount the system's users."

Applicant further respectfully submits that Haznek -- which the Examiner asserts teaches the various limitations of claim 5, including the step of "translating the user input received from a first network enabled code to a second network enabled code," recited therein -- does not teach or suggest the step of "translating the user input received from a first network enabled code to a second network enabled code," as recited in amended claims 1, 13, 25 and 27. The portions referenced by the Examiner as purportedly teaching this feature do not teach or suggest that user input is translated from a first network enabled code to a second enabled code, as required by the amended claims. Rather, those portions of Hanzek merely teach an embodiment of a web-based custom vehicle ordering and tracking system that uses XML messages to locate products in a database. Without more, Applicant respectfully submits Hazned cannot be said to teach the limitation of "translating the user input received from a first network enabled code to a second network enabled code."

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the above amendments and remarks regarding the rejections under §102(e), claims 1, 13, 25 and 27 are now allowable over the cited prior art.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending rejections under §103 are overcome by the amendments and arguments presented above. Accordingly, in view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1, 13, 25 and 27 are allowed over the art of record. Each remaining claim depends from either independent claim 1, 13, 25 or 25 and is therefore allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

Since the cited references, taken either singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the combinations set forth in the pending claims, and further fail to provide any motivation or suggestion of the desirability of modifying the structures or methods to arrive at the claimed combinations, Applicants submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejections, allow the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference or interview would advance prosecution of this application in any manner, the undersigned stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 or §1.117 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS, LLP

Dated: September 7, 2004   By: _____
Hunton & Williams, LLP   Brian M. Buroker
Intellectual Property Department   Registration No. 39,125
1900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)